

APR 2 1964

1964

Sanitized - Approved For Release : CIA-RDP75-00149R000200310020-7

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

6575

Mr. President, I am about to conclude. I should like to sum up briefly what I have covered today in such great detail.

First, it is an honor to make this affirmative case. It is long overdue. It is long overdue because the people of the United States may get an idea that we are living in a vacuum and that we do not know what is going on outside these quiet and peaceful walls. But there are riots in the streets. It is one thing to suppress riots when the causes they seek are public disturbance and the destruction of the social order. It is another thing to deal with riots in which people are expressing deeply held grievances from which they have suffered for years—for generations—and which we have been unable to do anything about, but which we recognize as a nation to exist, and which we are trying to recognize and do something about in areas of the country in which there exists this built-in, archaic social order which insists that because a man's skin is black, he is different from a white man and must be kept segregated from him.

Such a situation is intolerable in our present day. It should not exist. It is destructive of the Nation, and of the Nation's position in the world. It is that simple. It is going on every day outside this door in the far reaches of the country. We cannot stand still for it.

We should have full debate and consideration and solve the problem in every way compatible with our democratic processes, but let us understand that the days of the delay add to the days of aggravation, the days of continued public disorders, the days of continued deprivation of the Nation's conscience, and the continued deprivation of the Nation in terms of its economy, which is suffering now to the extent of between \$13 billion and \$17 billion a year in productivity because of the fact that Negroes are not given equal employment opportunities and equal educational opportunities.

Finally, when I began I said something about my own party. I would like to conclude on that note. My party has a great opportunity, just as the Democratic Party has in this struggle. We are the party of Lincoln. We are the party which was founded upon the concept of the free workingman and the urgent needs of that kind of economy. Many people in the South are beginning to realize that it is also absolutely essential to their section of the country.

The pride and integrity of our party are at stake in this struggle. I deeply believe that when the roll is called, and as the various developments take place upon which the roll must be called, my party will do its duty in the tremendous and dramatic struggle in which we are engaged.

I reject the idea that weakening amendments will be offered from our side which will complicate a situation which demands the national attention so urgently. I do not believe that the great majority of the members of the Republican Party in the Senate will stand for such an idea. I believe the great majority will find it untenable, and will reject it, as has been shown time

and time again on votes in the civil rights struggle, beginning in 1957, when the civil rights bill was intercepted at the Senate door and considered in the Senate, so that at long last, action might be taken on the problem.

We are face to face with a discussion of a meaningful civil rights bill which the administration supports, and behind which, in my judgment, are a majority of the Members of this body on both sides of the aisle.

It is said that when a majority of the Senate wants something, it can get it. I add to that statement the corollary that it can get it if it shows the necessary determination. We have the power to act, if the majority of the Senate will show the necessary determination. With God's help, it will.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I commend the Senator on the lucidity and force and clarity of the speech he has made.

Mr. JAVITS. I am extremely grateful to my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts for the kindness of his remarks on my speech. I thank him very much.

I yield the floor.

THE FALLACY THAT CASTRO IS HERE TO STAY

During the delivery of Mr. JAVITS' speech.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a study entitled "Terror and Resistance in Communist Cuba," which was made public on Tuesday by the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba.

We have been too prone to be pessimistic about Cuba. In recent months an increasing number of people have expressed the belief that Castro is here to stay, that our economic embargo is an exercise in futility, and that the best we can do is to reconcile ourselves to the reality of Castro and seek some way of living with him.

I believe that "Terror and Resistance in Communist Cuba" is the most effective reply that has yet been made to all those who advocate the passive acceptance of the Castro regime because they see no serious possibility of liberating Cuba from its clutches.

The policy of passive acceptance is based on three principal fallacies.

The first fallacy is the belief that the Castro regime, as tyrannical as it may be, nevertheless enjoys a substantial measure of popular support and that its hold over its people is, therefore, secure. It is this fallacy, in particular, that is demolished by the report, "Terror and Resistance in Communist Cuba."

The fundamental fact about Cuba, says this report, is that its people are waging an unrelenting war against the hated, despotic Communist regime. It draws a picture of a Cuba seething with discontent; of a Cuban people who continue their struggle for freedom undaunted by Castro's terror; of a regime that sits on

top of a veritable volcano of popular discontent that may erupt at any moment.

The second fallacy on which the apostles of passive acceptance base their case, is that Communist regimes in general are immune to popular revolt and therefore immune to overthrow. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The fact is that the total tyranny of communism has succeeded in breeding the most total popular hatred known to history. The past 10 years alone have witnessed the East German uprising, the Poznan revolt, the Hungarian revolution, the revolt of the Vorkuta slave laborers in the Soviet Union itself, and the Tibetan revolution. These heroic uprisings failed only because of the presence or direct intervention of the Soviet Army, or of the Red Chinese Army in the case of Tibet. But we have not yet seen the end of popular explosions against Communist tyranny.

The time or place of the next popular explosion against communism is something that no one can predict. But if such an explosion should take place in Cuba, the outcome would be different from the outcome of the Hungarian revolution. It would be different for the simple reason that the Soviets could not send 200,000 men and 5,000 tanks to crush the Cuban revolution, as they were obliged to do to crush the Hungarian revolution.

Apart from the fact that their theory is belied by history, I sometimes wonder whether those who regard Communist regimes as unassailable have stopped to assess the ultimate meaning of their assumption. If the Communists are free to subvert and overthrow non-Communist governments in various parts of the world at the tempo that has characterized the postwar period, and if the free world accepts every Communist conquest as final and irreversible, then, as surely as 2 and 2 makes 4, the whole world will ultimately be Communist.

The third fallacy on which those who propose a do-nothing policy in Cuba base themselves, is that the Castro regime, while admittedly a nuisance, does not pose any mortal threat to our security.

They do not deny that Castroism poses a threat to the stability and security of the other American states. This would be impossible to deny in the light of the bloody campaign of terrorism in Venezuela, the recent riots in Panama, the rising tide of Castroite leftism in other Latin American countries, and this day, at this hour, the ominous events in Brazil.

Nor would they deny that the mere existence of Castroism nullifies the Alliance for Progress and makes serious planning impossible because lack of confidence in the future frightens away new investment and makes for an actual process of disinvestment.

But, admitting all this, they still hold that Castro does not directly threaten the United States, and we should not therefore react in what they consider to be an exaggerated manner to the fact of his existence.

In the old days, there used to be a brand of isolationism which held that